FAX TRANSMISSION - Law Department

Honeywell

15801 Woods Edge Road Colonial Heights, VA 23834

RE-SENT

Date: 5/17/01

Examiner N. Eloshway

of Pages:

Company: **USPTO**

(including cover)

Fax #: 703-305-3579

Urgent

Please Review

Phone #:

From:

Virginia Szigeti Andrews

Reply ASAP

Fax #:

804-520-3568

Phone #: 804-520-3651

(Call if you did not receive all pages, or if document is illegible)

MESSAGE:

GROUP ART UNIT: 3727 SERIAL NO.: 08/747,471 FILED: November 12, 1996

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 30-3744CIP2CPA

Virginia Szeget andrews

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being sent via facsimile 703-305-3579 to Examin r Eloshway, on May 17, 2001.

Virginia Szigeti Andrews Registration No.: 29,039 **FAX RECEIVED**

MAY 1-8 2001

GROUP 3700

WARNING: Unauthorized interception of this facsimile transmission may be a violation of federal or State law.

This message is intended only for use by the Individual or entity to which it is addressed and contains privileged or confidential business information the disclosure of which may be a violation of federal or state law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is illegal and strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone, and return the original message to us at the address listed above via U.S. Postal Service. Thank you.

	 	<u>~' </u>			`		
AMENDMENT TRANSMITTAL LETTER					ATTORNEY'S DOCKET NO.: 30-3744CIP2		
ERIAL NUMBER: FILING DAT		ATE:	E: EXAMINER:			GROUP ART UNIT:	
08/747,471 Novem		ber 12, 1996		N. Eloshw	79V	3727	
	ITS AND ARTICL		DE THERI				
	OR PALLEY ET A ANT COMMISSIONE		TENTS	·			
Transmitted herev	with is an amendment i	n the abov	e-identified	application.	The fee has been c	alculated as	shown below.
		CL	AIMS AS A	MENDED			
(1)	(2) CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT	(3)	(4) HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR		(5) NO. OF EXTRA CLAIMS PRESENT	(6) RATE	(7) ADDITIONAL FEE
TOTAL CLAIMS	52	MINUS	5:	2	0	X 518	0
INDEP. CLAIMS	6	MINUS	6	; 	0	X \$78	0
					ADDITIONAL FEETHIS AMENDMENT		0
The under and reques	is sheet is enclosed. rigned petitions for any sts that the \$ 890.00 te copy of this sheet is e y additional fees to De	y extension	fee be	filing this do	cument required to Deposit Account No	nder 37 C.F.	R. 1.136
- Cuarge an	May 17, 2001	posit Accor	unt No. 01-1	lugia	ia Szigeti a	Indiews	
			_		Virginia Szigeti An-	drews	
804-520-3651 Phone				29,039 Reg. Number			
hereby certify that xaminer Eloshway	this correspondence is y, Group Art Unit 3727	being sent , on May	t via facsimi 17, 2001.	le to the Unit	ed States Patent Of Spanner Virginia Szigeti And Autorney of Record 804-520-3651	rdrees	5-3579, to
		_	-		(Date)		

Patent and Trademark Office - U.S. DEPARTMENT of COMMERCE

PATENTS IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Group Art Unit: 3727 Reg for Record
Examiner: N. Eloshway
P.D. File No.: 30-3744CIP2

In re Application of: IGOR PALLEY ET AL.

Serial No.:

08/747,471

Filed:

November 12, 1996

For:

BARRIER UNITS AND ARTICLES MADE THEREFROM

Colonial Heights, VA May 17, 2001

Assistant Commissioner for Patents Washington, DC 20231

Dear Sir:

Responsive to the Office Action mailed February 15, 2001, please enter the remarks that follow.

REMARKS

At the outset, Applicants note with appreciation the withdrawal of the finality of the last Office Action.

Applicants further note that there is no discussion of the rejection of claim 52 in the present Office Action although the Summary Sheet indicates that claim 52 stands rejected. Applicants request clarification on the grounds of rejection of claim 52.

Claims 16 and 20 stand rejected under 35 USC§112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. The Examiner maintains this rejection on the basis that there is insufficient antecedent support for the limitation "the interrupted band" in line 2 of each of these claims. Both of claims 16 and 20 are indirectly dependent on claim 1, which at line 6 refers to "said band being interrupted across the length thereof". This language, it is respectfully submitted, provides appropriate and sufficient antecedent support for the limitations forming the basis of